



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/393,300	09/10/1999	MOHAMED ANISUR RAHMAN	2925-237P	2520
30594	7590	12/02/2003		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				
EXAMINER				
MOORE, JAMES K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2686				

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/393,300	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAHMAN, MOHAMED ANISUR	
	<b>Examiner</b> James K Moore	<b>Art Unit</b> 2686	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: 17, 18, 33 and 41.

Claim(s) rejected: 13, 15, 16, 19, 32, 34-40 and 42-47.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 25-31.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See continuation sheet

*Charles Appiah*  
**CHARLES APPIAH**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

9/20/03

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 13, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection of claim 46, the applicant argues that the limitation at issue, "sending the received information from the central database to the service node, the received information indicating to the service node that the first wireless system should be queried in response to receiving a data message," is supported on page 8, lines 21-24 of the specification. See page 11 of the Arguments. However, this argument is unpersuasive because although the specification does support sending received information (redirection information) from the central database to service nodes, the specification does not describe this information as "indicating to the service node that the first wireless system should be queried in response to receiving a data message."

Regarding claim 13, the applicant argues that in the Lorello reference, the VLR must be in the same system as the HLR. See page 12 of the Arguments. However, this argument is unpersuasive because it is contrary to the widely known practice in the art of using a VLR to record information for a subscriber located in a visited system, which system is not the same system as the home system comprising a HLR associated with the subscriber.

Regarding claim 32, the applicant argues that it is not inherent that Ho's INSERT SUBSCRIBER DATA message includes the second wireless system identifier because Ho does not suggest such an identifier. See page 14 of the Arguments. However, the

Art Unit: 2686

examiner disagrees because although Ho does not mention such an identifier, it is crucial for the routing of the data message comprising the INSERT SUBSCRIBER DATA message that the data message include an identifier identifying the destination system, because as one of ordinary skill in the art is aware, the message cannot be routed without including an address indicating its destination.

Regarding claims 38 and 44, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a registration or deregistration flag – see page 15 of the Arguments) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

JKM

(703) 308-6042

  
CHARLES APPIAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER